

Appl. No. 09/938,085
Amdt. Dated December 7, 2005
Reply to Office action of August 23, 2001
Attorney Docket No. P14463-US1
EUS/IJ/P/05-3319

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claim Amendments

There have been no amendments to the claims. Claims 1-18 are pending in the application. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1, 4, 9, 12, 14 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by O'Flaherty (US 6,275,824). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of these claims.

The Applicant discloses a system and method for contacting an origin server from a node associated with a user. A minimal user profile containing only user designated CPI (Capabilities and Preferences Information), is generated by the user and stored within a node associated with the user. The minimal user profile is used to establish a connection with an origin server such that a determination may be made if the privacy policy of the origin server meets the privacy policy of the user. If the privacy policy of the origin server meets the privacy preferences of the user, the origin server may then be provided with a second user profile containing more detailed CPI. In a first embodiment, the node provides the second user profile within each request to the origin server. In an alternative embodiment, a single second user profile is forwarded to a WAP gateway interconnecting the node and the origin server, and this information is cached within the WAP gateway to replace the minimal user profile previously cached in this location. (Summary)

The O'Flaherty reference appears to disclose a system and method for managing data privacy. An individual's personal information is collected and stored in a database that is accessible by a third party. The O'Flaherty system disguises the individual's data and permits "data mining". A database is disclosed whose data content is linked to anonymous profiles of individuals associated with the data so as to protect the privacy of the individual whose data may be accessed. A database management system (dbms) is associated with a secure data "warehouse" containing the data and the client

Appl. No. 09/938,085
Amdt. Dated December 7, 2005
Reply to Office action of August 23, 2001
Attorney Docket No. P14463-US1
EUS/J/P/05-3319

profiles. Metadata "dataviews" (linked to the data) present the data requested to a third party as an "extended" database for individual privacy preferences when customers of the O'Flaherty system mine the secure data. A client interface module provides access to client (individual) data stored in the extended database (containing data accessible only by the customer through dataviews). (Col. 4, lines 2-29)

Furthermore in claims 9 and 14, the Detailed Action cites O'Flaherty for teaching a wireless communications node associated with a user. The Applicant has reviewed the cited portion and respectfully disagrees with the interpretation. The node referred to, communication media 140, is not identified as wireless. All the examples given are wireline type of media. Even if media 140 were identified as wireless, media 140 only accesses stored dataviews through the client interface module 122. Access may also be achieved indirectly through business apps 110 and the privacy service 150. Still, through media 140, the third party seeks and receives data from the secure data warehouse that has been "anonymized", which is in direct contrast to the Applicant's invention in which the user sends personal data to a server in order to initiate a connection.

A major difference between O'Flaherty and the present invention is that the personal information is the subject of the third party customer's interest and the information is not used to initiate or gain entrance to a server. A user's information is stored and made available, anonymously, for a third party customer. The only link between O'Flaherty and the present invention is the use of personal information. The Applicant uses some of the personal information to initiate a connection and O'Flaherty provides access to stored personal information of an anonymous client.

In the Response to Arguments in the Detailed Action; it is stated that O'Flaherty discloses a profile that includes less information than the actual profile and that the system uses that profile to perform the communications between the client and a server (Col. 5, lines 30-37). The Applicant has reviewed this cited portion of O'Flaherty and finds no reference to use of a minimal profile. Instead, the cited portion discusses a user desiring an anonymous transaction and the O'Flaherty system routing the transaction to a privacy service to provide the anonymity. The service accesses a

Appl. No. 09/938,085
Amdt. Dated December 7, 2005
Reply to Office action of August 23, 2001
Attorney Docket No. P14463-US1
EUS/JIP/05-3319

privacy rule database and according to the rules, removes all information from the transaction, which would identify the user. In contrast to O'Flaherty, the Applicant's present invention discloses a user (user agent, i.e., mobile terminal) that generates a minimum user profile (made up of some of the user's CPI) that identifies the user so as to initiate connection with a server in a wireless network.

Essentially the O'Flaherty reference discloses a system for providing anonymity of a user's stored data that is accessible to third parties. O'Flaherty provides a system that hides any connection between the information and the owner of the stored data. In direct contrast, the Applicant's invention uses a minimal amount of CPI (user information) to provide a limited identity of a user in order to establish an initial connection. This step is actually provides identifying information associated with the user.

As noted above, the Applicant's invention generates an initial profile for establishing a connection to an origin server to determine whether the privacy policies of the server are acceptable. O'Flaherty provides for customers, not associated with the client profiles to have access to the data but not to the actual identity of the client whose information is stored in the database; just the profile. On the one hand, the Applicant's invention provides a means to establish communications with an origin server having privacy policies acceptable to a user and on the other hand, O'Flaherty provides a database for data mining with the data linked to the profiles, not the identity, of the clients associated with the data.

O'Flaherty fails to provide a minimal user profile for an initial connection and also fails to provide a means for determining if the user and the server have compatible privacy policies. The O'Flaherty reference provides data linked to unidentified profiles, so there is no initial interrogation from the user about privacy profile to determine if the server meets the privacy preferences of a user. This being the case, O'Flaherty does not anticipate the present invention and the Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of claim 1 and dependent claim 4.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)

Appl. No. 09/938,085
Amdt. Dated December 7, 2005
Reply to Office action of August 23, 2001
Attorney Docket No. P14463-US1
EUS/JP/05-3319

Claims 2, 5, 6, 13, and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Flaherty in view of Leppinen (US 6,735,186). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of these claims

The Leppinen reference appears to disclose caching a profile in a WAP gateway and the Detailed Action relies on the teaching of Leppinen to overcome the deficiencies of O'Flaherty, which lacks caching a profile in a WAP gateway. More specifically, the Office Action asserts that the Leppinen reference sends a profile to a WAP gateway to help establish a WSP session.

The Applicant respectfully submits that the Leppinen reference fails to disclose at least the limitations of sending a first, minimal user profile to establish compatibility of an origin server's privacy policies with the user's privacy policy and then sending a second more complete profile. These limitations are recited in Applicant's claim 1 and analogous limitations are recited in claims 6, 9 and 14. Thus, claims 1, 6, 9 and 14 and all claims dependent therefrom (claims 2, 5, 13 and 18) are distinguishable from the Leppinen reference and a withdrawal of the rejection of these claims is respectfully requested.

Claims 3, 10, 11, 15 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Flaherty in view of Barrett (US 6,581,059). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of these claims.

The Barrett reference appears to disclose a system for providing personal information and information preferences associated with the personal information database. A database with personal information is made available to a requestor, according to an identifier, the information being requested and the conditions under which the information is to be used. Barrett's system is concerned with providing information from a database only to requestors that satisfy certain parameters before making the information available.

When a WSP or similar request is sent from a mobile station, more information is conveyed than that which comes with a request from a PC web browser. The mobile station information should be limited to as little as possible before learning the privacy

Appl. No. 09/938,085
Amdt. Dated December 7, 2005
Reply to Office action of August 23, 2001
Attorney Docket No. P14463-US1
EUS/J/P/05-3319

policy of the receiver. The Barrett reference is cited for teaching providing personal information to an origin server in response to a request from the server (Col. 6, lines 19-45). This step is a feature of Barrett and not of the present invention. In contrast to Barrett, the present invention initiates contact with the origin server using a limited profile and the user requests the privacy policies of the server, not the server requesting personal information from the user. As disclosed in Barrett, the server determines whether the user is cleared for retrieving information from the server. As claimed in the subject claims, the user requests the policy files from the server and the user compares the privacy policies of the server to the preferences of the user before sending the second profile.

Respectfully, the Barrett reference also does not disclose the limitations lacking in O'Flaherty and found in independent claims 1, 9 and 14. This being the case, these limitations, which are recited in claims 3, 10, 11, 15 and 16 are also not disclosed by Barrett. This being the case, the Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of these claims.

Claims 7 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Flaherty in view of Leppinen as applied to claims 2, 5, 6, 13 and 18 above, and further in view of Barrett (US 6581059). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of these claims.

As discussed above, neither O'Flaherty, Leppinen nor Barrett disclose the use of a minimal user profile to initiate a session between a user and an origin server and upon a satisfactory response from the server providing a more complete user profile if the server policy meets the preferences of the user. This being the case, the Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of these claims.


Appl. No. 09/938,085
Amdt. Dated December 7, 2005
Reply to Office action of August 23, 2001
Attorney Docket No. P14463-US1
EUS/J/P/05-3319

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicant believes all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

The Applicant requests a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,



By Sidney L. Weatherford
Registration No. 45,602

Date: December 7, 2005

Ericsson Inc.
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11
Plano, Texas 75024

(972) 583-8656
sidney.weatherford@ericsson.com